

political influence can only feed that latter perception, further eroding that trust.”

If the public sees any judge and Supreme Court Justices as politicians in robes, the public’s confidence in the courts and in the rule of law itself can only be diminished, diminishing the Court’s power, including its power to act as a check on other branches of government.

Last August, Gallup found that 58 percent of Americans approve of the job the Supreme Court is doing. In fact, the Supreme Court’s approval ratings have actually increased in the last several years. Polling from February of this year finds that 35 percent of Americans approve of the job that we in Congress are doing, and that is up from 15 percent not many days ago.

I raise this data to demonstrate that the Supreme Court is an institution which a majority of Americans continues to place its trust in. That is a significant circumstance in today’s polarized world, but a majority of Americans still believes it can trust the Supreme Court. If we in Congress inject ourselves into the size of the Court’s composition, Justice Breyer is exactly right, in that the trust the American people have that the rulings will be delivered on a fair reading of the law will be further undermined.

On the Republican side of the aisle, we have seen our share of defeats in recent years, and not once when the Republican Party controlled Congress and had the White House were there efforts to expand the Supreme Court. Can you imagine how the left or the media would react if President Trump had attempted to expand the Court to 13 Justices and add 4 Republican-nominated Justices during his tenure?

We have not attempted to expand the Court because the Supreme Court should not serve as another legislative body. That is our job—a job we need to do much better than we do today so that more than one-third of the American people can place their confidence in us as we pass laws.

We have had the same number of Supreme Court Justices for more than 150 years. Perhaps the Judiciary Act of 2021 is less an effort to expand the Supreme Court than it is an effort to intimidate sitting Justices to deliver rulings favorable to the ideology of my colleagues who are proposing the legislation. From guns to abortion, to religious liberties, to other hot-button issues, my colleagues are threatening the Justices either to deliver favorable rulings or to not take up divisive cases at all. If this is what my colleagues seek to accomplish, I am confident that the independence and integrity of our Justices will prevail. Indeed, this must prevail to preserve the American people’s confidence in the institution of the courts, in the judicial system, in the Supreme Court.

I am disappointed because, rather than working with each other across the aisle—across this aisle right here—

to pass legislation, the Democrats are more interested in pursuing a larger Supreme Court and more interested in eliminating the filibuster to pass their agenda—to stack the Court to prevent their legislation from being struck down as unconstitutional.

Process matters around here. We have to get to the point at which we utilize the process to get a fair and just result, wherein all people’s voices are heard, wherein all Members of the Senate have the opportunity to express their views and have an opportunity for that to be voted on, but we don’t skew the process to get a desired outcome. We all need to do our jobs to convince our colleagues that we are right in our positions, that our legislation is meritorious. We don’t and we shouldn’t change the process to get our way.

The checks and balances of our Constitution work. They have worked for a long time. They are important to this country. When we talk about how divisive things are on the Senate floor and in this country today, the solution to that is not to change the rules in the middle of the game. It is to abide by the rules that protect our freedoms and liberties.

I implore my colleagues to have the same faith in these constitutional guardrails as I do, to have the same faith in the independence and fairness of the Supreme Court that a majority of Americans has, and to believe that we can work together, that you and I can work together on behalf of the Americans we serve, the Americans we represent, without resorting to acts that will damage us all today and for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motions with respect to amendment 1445 and S. 937 be withdrawn; that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 937 on Thursday, April 22, the following amendments be reported by number and they be the only amendments in order: Cruz-Kennedy No. 1456, Lee No. 1425, Blackburn No. 1458; further, that at 11:30 a.m., the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order

listed; that amendment No. 1445, as amended, if amended, be agreed to; the bill be considered and read a third time; and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, with 60 affirmative votes required for adoption of the amendments and passage of the bill, with 4 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote, all with no intervening action or debate; and, finally, that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOE GROSSMAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, my friend Joe Grossman has approached his work for the last 35 years with a head for numbers and a heart for people. As an accountant turned CEO of the largest healthcare organization in Southeastern Kentucky, Joe’s experienced leadership has helped improve the quality of life for hundreds of thousands. This summer, Joe will close his chapter leading Appalachian Regional Healthcare, ARH, and a career of excellence and accomplishment. As he begins a well-deserved retirement, I would like to share my congratulations and gratitude for his many contributions to the Bluegrass.

For nearly two decades, Joe has been entrusted with key financial and operational positions at ARH. At each step, he has helped the system expand and thrive. When the position opened, Joe was the obvious choice to take over as president and CEO. He pushed ARH to continue growing in service to its patients, employees, and communities.

Today, the system operates 13 hospitals in Kentucky and West Virginia as well as 80-plus clinic locations. With a team of more than 6,000 dedicated professionals, ARH serves nearly 400,000 individuals across the region. The system’s extensive reach makes a transformative impact on rural Kentucky communities every day and helps make the area a destination for top-tier medical talent. Joe’s leadership even contributed to a national magazine naming ARH one of the Top 10 Employers in Kentucky.

Overseeing an organization of ARH’s size and importance would be a remarkable feat in any year, but Joe exceeded expectations once again during the pandemic. Last month, I visited the ARH facility in Hazard to speak with Joe and his team about the roll-out of the multiple safe and effective COVID-19 vaccines. At that time, three